



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,059	09/30/2003	Brent Dalmas Nelson	EDSC105US0	5833
34279	7590	05/21/2008		
DOCKET CLERK, DM/EDS				
P.O. DRAWER 800889				
DALLAS, TX 75380				
EXAMINER				
DAO, THUY CHAN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2192				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/21/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.

10/675,059

Applicant(s)

NELSON, BRENT DALMAS

Examiner

Thuy Dao

Art Unit

2192

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 07 April 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-20.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Tuan Q. Dam/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2192

Continuation of 11. Other:

1) "...The Examiner ignores the plain meaning of the terms 'standards compliant' and 'standards noncompliant', which clearly indicate whether or not the described object is compliant with a standard" (Remarks, page 11, first paragraph).

The examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's assertions. As set forth in the previous Office action mailed February 5, 2008, pp. 2-3, the claimed language merely calls for:

"A method for converting a first metamodel system that is standards-noncompliant into a second metamodel system that is standards-compliant ..." (claim 1, lines 1-2);

"substituting automatically a plurality of standards noncompliant hyperlinks with said first metamodel system with a plurality of standards-compliant hyperlinks (lines 4-5) ... "to yield said second metamodel system" (line 18).

That is to say, the claimed language defines converting a first metamodel system comprising a plurality of hyperlinks, which are standards noncompliant with a second metamodel system (i.e., standards compliant with said first metamodel system) to other hyperlinks, which are standards compliant with said second metamodel system.

The examiner further notes that if the claim limitation "standards-compliant hyperlinks" had been interpreted to be compliant with other standards besides "first metamodel system" and "second metamodel system", claims 1-20 would have been rejected under section USC 35 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention (i.e., compliant with which standards, wherein said standards were not described/disclosed in the originally filed disclosure and/or claims).

2) "...nothing in Vange 'yields' a second metamodel system, as claimed" (Remarks, page 11, paragraph 3):

The examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's assertions.

Vange explicitly teaches:

"a second metamodel system" as embedded in client devices, which may have physical limitations in the display size, color density, [0009]; limited code size and/or processing power, [0010]; FIG. 4, client device 205, [0070]-[0071];

automatically reformatting a plurality of hyperlinks, entity names, file names in a first metamodel system (e.g., embedded in servers 210-212, [0065]-[0066])

to yield said second metamodel system (e.g., FIG. 4B, using intermediary computer 206, [0064]; Request Reformat 408, Response Reformat 406, [0068], [0071]).

3) "substituting automatically a plurality of standards-noncompliant entity names with entities of said first metamodel system with standards-compliant entity names (Remarks, page 12, first paragraph):

The examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's assertions.

Vange explicitly teaches reformatting / rewriting / substituting links [0025]; Domain Name Server (DNS) redirection mechanism, [0054]; substituting a DNS (an alpha-numeric domain name) with a specific IP address [0056]).

4) "substituting automatically a plurality of standards noncompliant file names for associated files within said first metamodel system with a plurality of standards compliant file names for said associated files" (Remarks, page 12, third paragraph):

The examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's assertions.

Vange explicitly teaches substituting names from a HTML file to a XML file [0035]; substituting names from a first script file to a second script file [0036]; [0063]).

5) "organizing said entities having standards-compliant entity names into a plurality of files and folders having standards-compliant file names" (Remarks, page 12, last paragraph):

The examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's assertions.

Vange explicitly teaches caching mechanism in client device 205, [0059]; caching and organizing entities into files and folders for subsequent requests, FIG. 4A, Cache 403, [0069]-[0070]).

6) "Further, Vignette does not teach or suggest the various claimed automatic substitutions and conversions at all. The Examiner merely references different figures, showing different screenshots, and alleges that this somehow teaches the claim limitations" (Remarks, page 13):

The examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's assertions.

The examiner respectfully directs Applicant's attention to the Office action mailed February 5, 2008, pp. 8-9, wherein each rejected limitations have been identified and equated with corresponding components from Vignette V6.

The Applicant merely made assertions about page 4 and Figure 4 in Vignette V6. However, after further consideration, the examiner notes that Figure 4 was not relied to reject the claimed limitations.

In conclusion, the examiner respectfully maintains the 35 USC 102(b) rejections over claims 1-20 as being anticipated by Vange and claims 1, 10, and 19 as being anticipated by Vignette V6.